

Assessing the Teaching Staffs' Satisfaction of College of Social Sciences and Humanities of Jimma University

***Temesgen Alemu Terfa
Dambi Dollo University
College of Social Sciences and Humanities
Department of Journalism and Communications
Email:talemu43@gmail.com***

Abstract

The present paper aims to assess the teaching staffs' satisfaction of College of Social Sciences and Humanities of Jimma University. The satisfaction level of staffs and the factors having impact on their satisfaction level were the key objectives. Three kinds of closed questionnaire containing different items/ questions have been used for data collection regarding satisfaction analysis from different aspects. All of the items were measured by using a five-point Likert-type response scales, anchored at 5 very satisfied and 1 very dissatisfied. SPSS software has been used for data analysis of the questionnaire. General survey guided by well-structured questionnaire through convenience and simple random sampling have been administered across a sample of questionnaires respondents. Besides, head departments from each department of the college were purposively selected for interview in the study. The findings of the study indicated that the most dissatisfying extrinsic factors among the academics when rank-ordered from most dissatisfying to least dissatisfying are salary, working conditions, job policies and relationship with boss, and the dissatisfying intrinsic factor is achievement. Similarly, college incentives (fringe benefits) and salary (extrinsic), while career development (intrinsic) were the dissatisfying factors. Therefore, it is recommended that the college authorities should take the necessary measures in order to increase the teaching staffs satisfaction of the college being with the concerned bodies.

Key words: Satisfaction, extrinsic, intrinsic, factors

1.1. Background of the Study

Education in general and quality education in particular plays a very important role in bringing about the desired development of a country. Teachers play a great role in bringing the quality of education. Naseem I and Salman M (2015) point out that academic staff plays a vital role in the success of quality education and in the production of quality students. Cited in Naseem and Salman (2015) Capelleras (2005) states that academic staff of a higher

education institution is a key resource and have a major role to play in achieving the objectives of the institution.

Similarly, Nawai, et. al (2016) assert that academic workforce plays a vital role in determining the success of the vision and mission of a university. Machado, M., et. al (2010) state that the academic staff is an important constituent group within higher education institutions impacting the quality of the institutions and students' success. The academic staff can only do this if they are satisfied with their job. Bajracharya (2014) points out that job satisfaction of academic staff in Higher Education Institute (HEI) is important because it influences their motivation and performance that are so very influential in delivering quality education services. He adds that it is crucial to satisfy the needs and increasing number of academic staff in a university in order for them to deliver the best service for the university. This is true because the success of a university relies on the academic workforce (Bentley et al., 2013) cited in Bajracharya (2014). With the changing scenario of higher education towards globalization and world class recognition, the satisfaction issue became an important concern. Every Higher Education Institutions need to take the necessary steps to ensure that the services are being offered at satisfactory levels to all the stakeholders. From this perspective, it is vital to assess the satisfaction level of academic staff of a university.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

There are many assumed stakeholders for higher education, and based on previous research, the service quality and its dimensions have to be determined by higher education organization's stakeholders including students, their parents and family, academic and administration staff, and society, (Ruben, 1995; Quinn, Lemay, Larsen and Johnson, 2009).

Ravine, A. (2017) states that employee satisfaction is of utmost importance for employees to remain happy and also deliver their level best, and to work on their own will rather than out of any compulsion. Ravine goes on to state that satisfied employees seldom crib or complain and concentrate more on their work; they do not think of leaving their jobs during crisis but work hard together as a single unit to overcome challenges and come out of the situation as soon as possible. Redmond, B. F. (2016) asserts that job satisfaction also impacts a person's

general well-being for the simple reason that people spend a good part of the day at work. Consequently, a person's dissatisfaction with work could lead to dissatisfaction in other areas of life.

To support this idea, Bright (2008) reports that people who are happy with life are happier employees and show better organizational citizenship, courtesy and conscientiousness. On the contrary, Kazi & Zadeh (2001) assert that an imbalance or dissatisfaction in work leads to dissatisfaction in personal life. This implies that for organizations to remain competitive, they need to understand and address the issues around work-life balance to maintain job satisfaction among employees.

Chitra, R. (2017) lists three top advantages of job satisfaction at work place. Firstly, the work you submit will automatically be very good because you love what you do, and you are willing to do whatever it takes in order to go from strength to strength. Secondly, you will be eager to work and to take on new responsibility, and your attitude towards your work will be rather positive as well. Finally, you will automatically rise from strength to strength; you will love your job and will consequently perform all your duties to the best of your abilities.

Harison, S. and AkalaAkala, H. S. (2012) argue that the most valuable asset available to an organization is its people, thus retaining staff in their jobs is essential for any organization. University teaching and non-teaching staffs are the most valuable assets that impact the quality of education. Teachers will not only produce good quality leaders of future but also will contribute in the development of any country by educating the future generation. According to Tehseen, S. (2015) only motivated teachers perform well and produce good results by delivering the quality education to students. Only highly qualified and committed teaching staff or teachers can produce effective results by producing good quality students, who contribute to their country in future. Therefore, it is crucial for universities to keep the talented or key teaching staff. Cited in Curl, J. (2015), Strunk & Robinson (2006), assert that job satisfaction among teachers is the number one cause of attrition in the educational system, and teachers who are dissatisfied with their chosen careers are more likely to leave. To retain such teachers' universities should promote the level of job satisfaction of the teaching staff.

1.3. General Objective

The main objective of the study is to assess the teaching staff satisfaction of the College of Social Sciences and Humanities (CSSH) of Jimma University (JU).

1.3.1 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study are to:

1. investigate the level of the satisfaction of the academic staffs of the College of Social Sciences and Humanities (CSSH) of Jimma University (JU).
2. to identify the factors having impact on the levels of satisfaction of the teaching staff of the college.

1.4 Research Questions

The study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the satisfaction level of teaching staffs of the college of social sciences and humanities of Jimma University?
2. What are the factors affecting the satisfaction of the teaching staff of the college?

1.5. Scope of the Study

The study focuses only on the academic staffs (teaching staffs) of the College of Social Sciences and Humanities of Jimma University and it doesn't encompass the non-academic staffs and students of the college..

1.6. Significances of the Study

This study may be significant in providing the college management with a clearer understanding of teachers' level of satisfaction and factors that have influence on their satisfaction level so that they make efforts in improving the level in order to improve the quality of education. The research may also assist as a source of reference or springboard for researchers who may be interested in a similar area.

1.7. Limitations of the Study

This study has some limitations. Due to time and budget constraints, the present study was conducted in only one college. For future research, the academics of the other colleges of Jimma University and other public universities of the country should be included. If data is collected from greater number of colleges and universities, the result could be different. The other challenge was the time at which the study was allowed to be conducted was not convenient for the researcher to get the compulsory data especially from students.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

This chapter deals with the analysis of data received through the questionnaires (for the quantitative data), and additional comments on the questionnaire papers, an in depth interviews (for the qualitative data). It begins with addressing quantitative data followed by qualitative data. The two sets were merged by bringing the separate results together in the interpretation to facilitate the analysis.

4.1. Analysis of Educational Qualification

Table 1: Respondents' Characteristics

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Educational Qualification	BA	7	7.8	7.9
	MA	54	60.0	68.5
	PhD	28	31.1	31.5
	Total	89	98.9	100.0
	Missing	1	1.1	
	Total	90	100.0	

As indicated in Table 1, the majority of the respondents (60.7%) are MA holders, while 31.5% are PhD holders. Only 7.9% are BA holders.

Table 2: Extrinsic Factors

Characteristics	N	Range	Sum	Mean	St. Dev.
Salary	89	4.00	231	2.5831	1.089
Relationship with Boss	89	4.00	308.75	3.4393	1.328
Relationship with Colleagues	88	4;00	320.8	3.6566	1.035

Job Policies	90	4:00	300	3.3333	1.127
Work Cond.	90	4	248	2.7555	1.336

Table 2 above displays extrinsic factors that affect the academic staff's job satisfaction. These factors include salary, relationship with boss, and relationship with colleagues, job policies and work conditions. As it can be seen from table 2 above, the mean for the teachers' relationship with their colleagues (3.6566) is the highest, and is more than (3.5) and close to the second highest score (point) (4) on Likert Scale. This indicates, then, that the academic staffs are probably satisfied with the relationship with their colleagues. However, the mean for their relationship with their bosses is (3.4393) which indicates that the academic staff are perhaps significantly less satisfied or dissatisfied with their relationship with their bosses. Similarly, the mean in job policies implies that job policies (3.3333), a mean less than (3.5) indicates that the academic staff may not be satisfied with the job policies of the college.

On the contrary, the mean for work conditions (2.7555), and the mean for salary (2.583), respectively, which are less than the expected mean (3), are the least as compared with the mean for the other extrinsic factors shown in table 2. The mean in each of these job factors is similar with the point on Likert Scale (2) given for 'Disagree' (Dissatisfied). This indicates that the teachers disagree to their satisfaction with work conditions and salary.

Table 3: Intrinsic Factors

Characteristics	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	St. Dev.
Achievement	89	1.00	5.00	3.453	0.903
Work Itself	89	1.00	5.00	3.860	0.750
Advancement	86	1.00	5.00	3.500	0.192
Responsibility	8	1.00	5.00	3.500	1.651

Table 3 above displays four intrinsic factors related to the teaching staff's job satisfaction: achievement, work itself, advancement and responsibility. The highest mean for the academic staff's satisfaction is indicated for job itself (3.860). This mean, which is close to the Likert Scale (4), satisfied or (agree), implies that the academic staff are satisfied with job itself; that

is; the staff are intrinsically most satisfied with job itself. The mean for advancement and responsibility is the second highest (3.500), which again is close to the Likert Scale (4). This implies that the academic staffs are perhaps intrinsically satisfied with their job linked with advancement and responsibility. However, the mean for achievement (3.453) which is less than (3.5), indicates that the teaching staff are perhaps less satisfied with their achievement in their work as compared with their satisfaction with the other intrinsic factors.

4.2. Qualitative Data Analysis and Interpretation

The analysis of the qualitative data is based on the additional comments received from respondents on the questionnaire papers and interview conducted with the department heads and top management. Just as for the analysis of the quantitative data, the analysis of the qualitative data is done by categorizing the responses into satisfaction factors. The responses received for each factor is almost the same.

4.2.1. Data Analysis and Interpretation on the Extrinsic Factors

a) Working Environment

According to the views of academic staff, the major challenges linked with working environment include shortage of: stationery materials and facilities. The lack of facilities includes shortage of toilets, shortage of classrooms and their facilities, shortage of spaces (offices) for teachers and a problem linked with the poor set up of the offices, and lack of housing services (apartments) for teachers.

There is shortage of stationery materials, materials such as paper, whiteboard marker pens, chalk, and duplication ink. As these materials are directly linked with teaching and learning, they have a direct negative impact on the teachers' level of satisfaction.

The problem the teachers raised as a major and most serious factor affecting their level of satisfaction is shortage of toilets. The toilets in the building of Social Sciences and Humanities (CSSH) are not functioning. This obliges the teachers to go far away to the other toilets of the university. This is not only tiresome but also timewasting for the teachers as they have to go upstairs and downstairs every day just to use toilets. Many of the teachers and guests visiting the college have to share the nearby toilet with students, which is unfair. Related to

the problem of toilet is shortage of hygiene. Since there is no water in the building, there is a sanitation problem in the building.

There are also other facilities lacking in the college. These include recreation centers like playing stations such as table tennis and other indoor games. Apart from this, the spaces in the university lounges for teachers are usually occupied by students, which rob teachers of their right of privacy. Moreover, there is a shortage of laboratory for Oromo Folklore, laboratory equipment for Geography Department, offices for classroom attendants, rehearsal and sound proof rooms and lack of space to store musical instruments for Music Department.

The shortage of classrooms and their facilities is linked with three main problems. First, there is an imbalance between the number of classrooms and the number of programs (BA, MA and PhD). Secondly, many of the classrooms are not smart, lacking LCD, and even the non-smart ones are not properly facilitated with appropriate blackboards and whiteboards. The third problem is connected with the distance and location of the classrooms. The classroom buildings are very far away from the offices of the teachers and from each other. Moreover, their location is not known. This is because there are no labels or signs on the campus that indicate the directions of the rooms, the number of the rooms and the number of the blocks in which the rooms are found. These problems demotivate the teachers directly impacting their level of satisfaction because the teachers have to waste their time as well as the teaching and learning time looking for the rooms especially during final examinations, make-up examinations and make-up classes.

Two major problems are linked with shortage of spaces (offices) for teachers. The first and major problem is related to the poorly designed building and set up of the offices. The teachers using the offices on the left side of the building find it very difficult to stay in their offices working in the afternoons because the offices are very hot. This hot temperature results from the sunshine that enters the offices. The other problem is connected to the size of the offices__ there is a mismatch between the size of the offices and the number of teachers who share them.

Agbozo, G. K. et. al. (2017) state that supportive work environments help workers to perform normal duties more effectively, making best use of their knowledge, skills and competences

and the available resources in order to provide high-quality services. This implies that if the level of satisfaction of the university academic staff increases, the academic staff will make best use of their knowledge, skills and competences and the available resources in order to provide high-quality services. This in turn will have a positive contribution to the quality of education. Strengthening this view, Agbozo, G. K. et. al. (2017) assert that the working environment is one of the most crucial factors which influence the level of satisfaction as well as motivation of its employees.

b) Pay

The academic staff said they are dissatisfied with the amount of pay they receive. Here, pay is divided into two forms: salary and pay for various activities. The teachers responded that they are not satisfied with both types of pay. The teachers said the salary they are paid is lower in comparison with the amount of money they spend for living every month. This is because life has become more expensive than ever.

The second form of pay which teachers are dissatisfied with include pay for various services such as distance learning activities, summer course and extension classes, advisory services, house rent. Payments related to distance education involve setting exams, marking exam papers and recording students' grades. The pay for these activities is not only low and unfair, but also untimely. 35% is deducted from the pay. When this percentage was decided, the salary of a teacher with an MA degree was 4000.00 per month and 100 Birr per hour. The scale for salary has been change three times since. The amount of pay per hour should also have been changed (improved) with the amount of salary. In addition, the pay for advisory service is insignificant. The amount of pay per advisee is only 0.33, which in comparison with the workload is insignificant. Furthermore, the pay for house rent is much less than the amount teachers pay because house rent has increased.

In brief, low pay for salary, distance learning activities, summer course and extension classes, advisory services and house rent has impacted the level of job satisfaction of the academic staff. Cited in Usman, S. et. al (2013) Akram (2012) argues that if organizations want to retain competitive employees, they must be able to provide them with good working conditions,

competitive salaries, employment security and autonomy. Akram (2012) further concludes that financial aspects especially salary is the most important among above variables because each employee needs a livelihood to support his/ her family.

According to a survey conducted by Vermandere and Caroline (2013) on the impact of salary on job satisfaction, the feeling of not being paid fairly in relation to workload has a negative impact on motivation. Employees unhappy with levels of pay were more inclined to change jobs (37%) than employees who felt their salary was fair (18%). This implies that the College of Social Sciences should work hand-in-hand with the university top management and other concerned bodies to improve the pay for academic staff.

c) Job Policies

Teachers' complaints about low pay for: services like setting, marking and recording distance education papers, offering advisory services, extension and summer course classes, and compensation for house rent might be linked with the issue of either absence or clarity of a job policy. Most of the teachers complain that the pay for the activities mentioned is unfair. The teachers' complaints might have resulted from lack of awareness of why the pay for the services or activities is low. This implies that there should be clear, fair and up-to-dated policy regarding the pay for the various activities teachers do and the money for house rent. Dugguh, S. and Dennis, A. (2014) argue that fairness and clarity of job policies are crucial in improving employee attitude.

d) Relationship with Boss

According to the view of many respondents, the relationship between teachers and the college management is not smooth. Three major reasons were mentioned for this. First, the top management lacks transparency. Second, they reflect bossy (employer-employee) type of relationship which they reflect on meetings and in letters. Third, they do not entertain ideas, take comments and listen to individuals.

Shriar (2015) asserts that 75% of people don't quit their job, they quit their boss. He goes on saying that having a bad boss can really ruin any chance of engagement that you might have had at a company. The way a manager treats their employees is so important, since employees

are looking up to managers as coaches. They are eager to learn from them, so not teaching them is a waste. Help them grow, and they will help you. This might increase the attrition rate of teachers. This implies that the top management should be aware of this and create positive relationships with the academic staff of the college.

In general, according to the qualitative data discussed above, the academic staffs are not satisfied with four job factors: working environment, low pay, job policies and relationship with boss, which juxtapose with the quantitative data (*See table 3*).

e) Extrinsic Factor: Achievement

The academic have low satisfaction in achievement probably because they are dissatisfied with all or some of the factors of achievement: work empowerment, work autonomy, recognition and reward, opportunity of position promotion, and sense of self professional status (*See table 2*).

Finding, Conclusion and Recommendation

5.1. Findings

The purpose of the study is to assess the satisfaction of the teaching staffs of College of Social Sciences and Humanities (CSSH) at Jimma University (JU). The analysis was aimed at investigating the level of satisfaction and factors affecting the satisfaction of the teaching staffs of the college. The findings that have come out from the analysis and interpretation of the quantitative and qualitative data are presented as follows.

The intrinsic factors which the academic staff are generally satisfied with when the rank ordered from the highest to the lowest degree are the work itself, advancement and responsibility, both of which have the same average mean, respectively. The extrinsic factor which the teachers are satisfied with is relationship with colleagues.

The dissatisfying intrinsic factor to the academics is achievement. The extrinsic job satisfaction factors rank-ordered from most dissatisfying to least dissatisfying to the academics are salary, working conditions, job policies and relationship with boss.

5.2. Conclusion

Teachers are generally satisfied with the job satisfaction factors: work itself, advancement, responsibility and relationship with colleagues. However, they are dissatisfied with salary, working conditions, job policies and relationship with boss.

5.3 Recommendations

In line with the findings and objectives of the study the following recommendations are taken.

- Academic staff's low salary, low and unfair pays in different activities, as well as for house rent, and housing problems should be solved.
- Priority should be given to creating favorable working environment in order to facilitate the teaching and learning process and assure the required quality in education.
- Friendly and transparent conditions for a smooth relationship between the management and the teachers should be created.
- There should be a means by which the academic staff's satisfaction can be enhanced.
- Job policies should be openly clarified to the academic staff through induction and other related meetings.

References

Agbozo, G. K., Iwysy, I. S. and Hoedoafia, Ms. A. (2017) The Effect of Work Environment on Job Satisfaction: Evidence from the Banking Sector in Ghana. Journal of Human Resource Management. Volume 5, Issue 1, February 2017, Pages: 12-18.

Bajracharya, A. and Hinai, Z.A. (2014) A Study on the Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff in Higher Education Institution.

Bright, J. (2008, February 9). Happy staff get a life; The ladder. *Sydney Morning Herald*, p. 7.

Capelleras, J.L. (2005), "Attitudes of academic staff towards their job and organisation: an empirical assessment", *Tertiary Education and Management*, Vol. 11, pp. 147- 66. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)[\[CrossRef\]](#)

Chitra, R. (2017) advantages and Disadvantages of Job Satisfaction
<https://content.wisestep.com/advantages-disadvantages-job-satisfaction/>

Curl, J. (2015) Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff Job Satisfaction. *Olivet Nazarene University*, jcurl@olivet.edu.http://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/edd_diss

Dugguh, S. I. and Dennis, A. (2014) Job satisfaction theories: Traceability to employee performance in organizations. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM) e-ISSN: 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 16, Issue 5. Ver. I (May. 2014), PP 11-18*
www.iosrjournals.org www.iosrjournals.org 11 |

Harison, K.(2013) Why Employee Recognition is So Important
http://www.cuttingedgepr.com/articles/emprecog_so_important.asp

Kazi, G., & Zadeh, Z. (2011). The Contributions of Individual Variables: Job Satisfaction and Job Turnover. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*. Retrieved from <http://journal-archieves8.webs.com/984-991.pdf>

Shriar, J. (2015)Infographic: 10 Things That Define Employee Engagement(<https://www.officevibe.com/blog/10-pillars-employee-engagement-infographic>

Naseem I and Salman M (2015) (2005). Job satisfaction among academic staff in private universities

Nawai, N. C., Ismail, M., Asru, M., Ibrahim, I. M. A., Raston, N. A., Zamzamin, Z. Z., and Jaini, A. (2016) Job Satisfaction among Academic and Non-Academic Staff in Public Universities in Malaysia: A Review. *International Journal of Business and Management*; Vol. 11, No. 9; 2016. [file:///C:/Users/yberkessa/Downloads/59939-220344-1-PB%20\(3\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/yberkessa/Downloads/59939-220344-1-PB%20(3).pdf)

Quinn, A. Lemay, G. Larsen, P. Johnson, D. M. (2009). "Service Quality in higher education", (2nd ed., vol. 20, pp. 139-152)

Ruben, B.D. (1995), *Quality in Higher Education*, Transaction Books, New Brunswick, NJ.

Redmond, B. F. (2016) Job Satisfaction.
<file:///C:/Users/user/Desktop/JOB%20SATISFACTION%20%28ESSENTIAL%29.htm>

Tehseen, S. (2015) Factors Influencing Teachers' Performance and Retention.(2015)www.researchgate.net/publication/271721909_Factors_Influencing_Teachers'_Performance_and_Retention

Vermandere and Caroline (2013) Impact of salary on job satisfaction. Eurofund.htm